

Meeting Notes

Project: Gasworks Park
Date: March 12th, 2003
Location: Hamilton Middle School

Page: 1 of 4
Time: 7:00 PM

In addition to members of the public (per sign in sheets), the meeting was attended and facilitated by:

Tim Motzer, Project Manager, Seattle Parks and Recreation
Mareatha Counts, Seattle Parks and Recreation
Jeff Girvin, The Berger Partnership
Guy Michaelson, The Berger Partnership
Elizabeta Stacishin, The Berger Partnership

Purpose: Community Meeting #3, Presentation of Gasworks NW Corner *Preferred Concept Plan*

Meeting Summary:

Introduction

Tim Motzer introduced the project:

1. Outlining “how we got here” including summary of the last meeting and next steps in the process.
2. Describing proposed future process and schedule.
3. Reviewing policy and decision making process and policy regarding off-leash area.

Design Presentation

The Berger Partnership’s Guy Michaelson presented the “Preferred Concept Plan” to the public and presented the derivative plan showing what portions of the presented project could be completed for the project budget. The derivative budget generally included soil work, contamination cover, irrigation, grass, paths and selective wall cuts and removal. In presenting the design, care was taken to summarize what components of the previously presented three alternatives were incorporated into the Preferred Concept. The presentation also addressed the comments of other review groups, including PROVIEW, Landmarks Board, and Design Commission and how their comments influenced the Preferred Concept Plan.

Meeting Notes

Project: Gasworks Park
Date: March 12th, 2003
Location: Hamilton Middle School

Page: 2 of 4
Time: 7:00 PM

Community Comment

Attendees of the meeting were provided the opportunity to comment regarding the Preferred Concept Plan. Community members may also submit written comments to the design team. The following is a general summary of comments and issues, not a record of every comment or commenter (In addition to the comments noted below, a summary of comments/ideas/input were recorded by a representative of Seattle Parks and Recreation).

- Do not do any site grading or cut wall, saves money, to be used to create off-leash area (OLA).
- Concerned over who will be using the new area, possibly just condo owners?
- No more passive use in corner, OLA in corner instead.
- Be more aggressive in tree removal, too few trees proposed for removal, would block all Wallingford views in time.
- Design should include OLA in “containment wall area”
- Supports tree removal, but thinks more trees should be “thinned” for horticultural health of stand.
- Supports proposed compromise of OLA where shown.
- Pleased with preferred concept.
- Full budget should go to creation of the “camera obscura”, no work in NW corner.
- Wants to see more trees removed from park, particularly cedars.
- Expand proposed OLA to north, to south edge of exiting evergreens.
- Wants OLA in NW corner, proposed OLA is too small, doomed to failure.
- Who decides what character is appropriate, not “some designers on board” but the public. Listen to public, create large OLA.
- Proposed OLA is too small, insincere response of designers.
- Creation of the proposed open space is worst thing that can be done for safety.
- Generally supports proposed plan (but disappointed with fill on site). Supports “derivative” priorities.
- Construction estimates inflated, hire “Millionaires club” workers to stretch budget and use savings for OLA.
- Cedars not native and are genetically altered, remove and plant cherries like Washington D.C.
- Not supportive of removing trees.

Meeting Notes

Project: Gasworks Park
Date: March 12th, 2003
Location: Hamilton Middle School

Page: 3 of 4
Time: 7:00 PM

- Likes plan, keep OLA out of containment area, but enlarge to south edge of cedars.
- Supports larger OLA, dogs build community.
- Put OLA in NW corner, use split rail fence to contain dogs, can be done cheaply.
- Supports larger OLA, will not be muddy due to bigger size.
- Supports compromise on OLA.
- Vegetation should not block views to water.
- OLA should be bigger than a tennis court.
- Supports connection between NW corner and greater park
- New trees should be low scale
- Lighting should be included in budget.
- Thinks cost estimate/spending is too high in overhead.
- Don't cut down trees, especially to satisfy condo owners.
- Project is well scaled
- Connection between parks and steps is key.
- Comments are unfairly weighted to OLA through heavy lobbying.
- Do not cut NW corner of wall, retain and make OLA
- Is very pleased with plan.
- Likes picnic area.
- Would like to see stormwater treatment incorporated into plan
- Do not let the overall vision be compromised by the current budget.
- Opposed to OLA, wants to see more trees removed.
- Do not get "nostalgia" for old gasworks, lose the wall and old tanks.
- Do not remove trees.
- Keep wall in NW corner same height
- In favor of planting new cedars at NW corner.
- Proposed OLA is too small, worthless, don't build it.
- OLA area in an inappropriate location near Harbor patrol.
- Dislikes dogs and their owners in parks, so build a place for them to go, preferably asphalt for clean up.
- Too many trees removed, retain more of the cedars, narrow gap to park
- Railroad ROW should be a space pedestrians walk through, like a valley in vegetation.

Meeting Notes

Project: Gasworks Park
Date: March 12th, 2003
Location: Hamilton Middle School

Page: 4 of 4
Time: 7:00 PM

- Gas Works was not for OLA in Pro Parks Language, and to put in an OLA in spite of that is wrong.
- Generally supports plan and unification of park as a whole.
- Eliminate cedars for safety for visibility.
- Endorses approach to proposed OLA.
- Not appropriate to turn over to one use (OLA)
- Disappointed by lack of dog owner recognition, dog owners are taxpayers.
- Dogs make parks safer.
- Opposed to incorporating tennis court into park where no OLA is incorporated.
- Lock whole park up at night.
- Dog haters have too much of park's acreage as is.
- Leave wall and consider actively programmed athletics in space.
- Feels the consent decree prohibits proposed plan.
- Likes reduced wall in NW corner
- OLA will improve traffic congestion, no need to drive to SP Magnuson Park; angry that “design communities” do not support OLA.
- Wants to know who “design review teams” are; they are not listening to citizens
- Volume of pro-OLA comments shows how devoted dog community is, all parks should have an OLA.

Written comments submitted at the meeting include:

- Opposition to OLA at gasworks
- Generally supportive of proposed plan and OLA as proposed.
- Generally supportive of plan and its unification of the park as a whole.
- Strongly supports measures to improve views in and around the park.

Meeting Wrap-Up:

Tim outlined next steps for the design and community input process, further revisions to the “Preferred Concept Plan” and presentation to the Parks Board.